IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 6831 OF 2005

Railway Station Handicapped
Telephone Booth Hlders' Assocaition
of Solapur Divsion of Central Railway...Petitioner

Versus

The Union of India and Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. J.G. Reddy for Petitioner.
Mr. T.J. Pandian for Respondents.

CORAM : F.I. REBELLO &
DR.D.Y.CHANDRACHUD,JJ.
DATED : FEBRUARY 07, 2006

P.C.

. The Petitioners representing handicapped telephone booth holders had moved this court in the matter of certain policy instructions and also in respect of the demand made by the respondents in the matter of licence fees etc.

. The respondent have filed a reply wherein it is set out that the policy has been revised and pursuant to the change of policy all the booth holders in various other divisions and Zones have agreed to the same and are paying accordingly. One of the Petitioners R.B. Mantri had promised to pay the commission at the lower rate of

10% for commission charges and other charges, as per revised policy. However, he failed to pay the same. It is further pointed out that the Government of India, Ministry of Railway/Railway Board vide circular dated 11.3.2003 has conveyed a decision to extend the contract period upto 27.4.2007 only in case of physically handicapped booth holders. On the respondents' seeking clarifications prayed for vide its letter dated 25.4.2005 have clarified to those booth holders who do not agree to these conditions and have filed case in the court, can be considered only when they withdraw their cases and comply with the conditions as laid down.

. Considering the above, we do not think that this is a fit case for this court to exercise its extra ordinary jurisdiction. The Petitioners if they seek to run the telephone booth, will have to pay the charges as levied for handicapped persons by the railways and comply with other requirements which they are called upon and in which event their contract would be extended upto 27.4.2007. The handicapped booth holders are given two months time fro today to pay the outgoings and enter into agreement with the Respondents. With the above observations, the order of status quo granted earlier

stands vacated. Petition rejected.

(F.I. REBELLO,J.)

(DR. D.Y. CHANDRACHUD,J.)